

**PARKER DANIELS KIBORT**

Andrew Parker (028314)  
888 Colwell Building  
123 Third Street North  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401  
parker@parkerdk.com  
Telephone: (612) 355-4100  
Facsimile: (612) 355-4101

**OLSEN LAW, P.C.**

Kurt Olsen (D.C. Bar No. 445279)\*  
1250 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
Telephone: (202) 408-7025  
[ko@olsenlawpc.com](mailto:ko@olsenlawpc.com)

\* Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*

Alan M. Dershowitz (MA Bar No. 121200)#  
1575 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02138

# To be admitted *Pro Hac Vice*

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Kari Lake; Mark Finchem,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Kathleen Hobbs, as Arizona Secretary of  
State; Bill Gates; Clint Hickman; Jack Sellers;  
Thomas Galvin; and Steve Gallardo, in their  
capacity as members of the Maricopa County  
Board of Supervisors; Rex Scott; Matt Heinz;  
Sharon Bronson; Steve Christy; Adelita  
Grijalva, in their capacity as members of the  
Pima County Board of Supervisors,

Defendants.

No. 2:22-cv-00677-JJT

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR LEAVE  
TO FILE THEIR MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AND  
SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM IN  
EXCESS OF THE PAGE LIMIT**

(Honorable John J. Tuchi)

1 Pursuant to Local Rule 7.2(e), Plaintiffs Kari Lake and Mark Finchem (“Plaintiffs”),  
2 hereby move for an order granting leave to file a motion for preliminary injunction and  
3 supporting memorandum of law that does not exceed 35 pages. Under Local Rule 7.2(e), unless  
4 otherwise permitted by the Court, the current page limit for such a motion is 17 pages. Plaintiffs  
5 have endeavored to draft their motion and memorandum as succinctly as possible. Under the  
6 current page limit, however, Plaintiffs are unable to present their arguments in sufficient detail to  
7 provide this Court and Defendants with the complete factual and legal basis for their motion.

8 Plaintiffs’ motion for preliminary injunction and supporting memorandum involves a  
9 constitutional challenge to the use of electronic voting machines in the upcoming election.  
10 Such election challenges call for this Court to engage in an “intense[ly] factual inquiry[,]”  
11 *Gonzalez v. Arizona*, 485 F.3d 1041, 1050 (9th Cir. 2007) that bears on systems used to cast,  
12 tabulate, and verify millions of votes expected to be cast by Arizona voters in the upcoming  
13 election. *See also Ariz. Democratic Party v. Hobbs*, 18 F.4th 1179, 1199 (U.S. 9th Cir. 2021);  
14 *Feldman v. Reagan*, 843 F.3d 366, 387 (9th Cir. 2016).

15 In order to fully present its argument for a preliminary injunction, Plaintiffs’ motion and  
16 supporting memorandum must describe in sufficient detail the Plaintiffs’ challenge to the use  
17 of electronic voting machines. This will require Plaintiffs to set forth the constitutional  
18 requirements applicable to the Defendants and the ways in which the use of electronic voting  
19 machines fail to meet those requirements. Further, Plaintiffs’ motion and supporting  
20 memorandum must set forth the irreparable harm that Plaintiffs will face if the use of  
21 electronic voting machines is not enjoined, as well as the impact that an injunction will have on  
22 Defendants and the public as a whole. To this end, Plaintiffs will file five supporting  
23 declarations from experts in the field of election systems and cybersecurity. Proper treatment  
24 of these issues by Plaintiffs will require them to exceed the standard page limit.

25 The reliability and security of electronic voting machines are matters of great  
26

1 significance to the nation as a whole, as evidenced by the robust public debate that surrounded  
2 their use for a number of years. It is all the more critical, therefore, to have as complete an  
3 argument as possible in this matter.

4 Granting Plaintiffs' request will not prejudice Defendants. Should this motion be  
5 granted, Plaintiffs will not oppose a similar request by Defendants for leave to file a response  
6 with a comparable number of pages.

7 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court grant its Motion  
8 for Leave to File its Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Supporting Memorandum in  
9 Excess of the Page Limit.

10  
11 DATED: June 8, 2022.

**PARKER DANIELS KIBORT LLC**

12 By /s/ Andrew D. Parker

13 Andrew D. Parker (AZ Bar No. 028314)  
14 888 Colwell Building  
15 123 N. Third Street  
16 Minneapolis, MN 55401  
17 Telephone: (612) 355-4100  
Facsimile: (612) 355-4101  
parker@parkerdk.com

18 **OLSEN LAW, P.C.**

19  
20 By /s/ Kurt Olsen

21 Kurt Olsen (D.C. Bar No. 445279)\*  
22 1250 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 700  
23 Washington, DC 20036  
24 Telephone: (202) 408-7025  
25 ko@olsenlawpc.com

26 \* Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*

1  
2  
3 By /s/ Alan M. Dershowitz  
4 Alan M. Dershowitz (MA Bar No. 121200)<sup>#</sup>  
5 1575 Massachusetts Avenue  
6 Cambridge, MA 02138  
7 <sup>#</sup> To be admitted *Pro Hac Vice*

8 *Counsel for Plaintiffs Kari Lake*  
9 *and Mark Finchem*  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on June 8, 2022, I electronically transmitted the foregoing document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the CM/ECF registrants on record.

/s/ Andrew D. Parker